

Message

From: Kaiser.Russell@epa.gov [Kaiser.Russell@epa.gov]
Sent: 3/7/2019 1:08:52 AM
To: Frazer, Brian [Frazer.Brian@epa.gov]
Subject: Fwd: Rosemont

FYI. Will have verbal points for discussion. Thanks, Russ

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Ziegler, Sam" <Ziegler.Sam@epa.gov>
Date: March 6, 2019 at 6:49:17 PM EST
To: "Kaiser, Russell" <Kaiser.Russell@epa.gov>
Subject: Rosemont

FYI as per your request. SZ

From: Blake, Ellen
Sent: Wednesday, March 6, 2019 2:50 PM
To: Ziegler, Sam <Ziegler.Sam@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: EPA Rosemont files from Tony Davis

Ellen Blake
Water Division
U.S. EPA Region 9
75 Hawthorne Street
San Francisco, CA 94105
Tel: (415) 972-3496
blake.ellen@epa.gov

The information contained in this message, including any attachments hereto, may be privileged, confidential and/or exempt from disclosure under applicable laws. It is intended for the recipient only. If you are an agency employee or consultant, please consult with the sender prior to disclosing the contents of this message to third parties. If you have received this transmission in error, please notify the sender by reply email and delete the message and any attachments.

From: Ebbert, Laura
Sent: Wednesday, March 06, 2019 2:28 PM
To: PerezSullivan, Margot <PerezSullivan.Margot@epa.gov>; Quast, Sylvia <Quast.Sylvia@epa.gov>; Strauss, Alexis <Strauss.Alexis@epa.gov>; Blake, Ellen <Blake.Ellen@epa.gov>; Torres, Tomas <Torres.Tomas@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Rich <Campbell.Rich@epa.gov>; Goldmann, Elizabeth <Goldmann.Elizabeth@epa.gov>; Glenn, William <Glenn.William@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: EPA Rosemont files from Tony Davis

All,

OW will prepare responses to this and any future press inquiries on this topic. They will run those answers through OGC, and keep R9 informed as responses develop. They'll work with HQ-OPA and R9-OPA to determine who best to transmit responses once final. They'll get started on this item first thing

tomorrow, and hope to have us something tomorrow afternoon. My contact at OW for future inquiries is Allison Dennis.

Please let me know ASAP if you have concerns about this approach.

Thanks,

LE

Laura Ebbert
Acting Chief of Staff
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9
75 Hawthorne Street
San Francisco, CA 94105
(415) 947-3561

From: PerezSullivan, Margot
Sent: Wednesday, March 6, 2019 1:32 PM
To: Quast, Sylvia <Quast.Sylvia@epa.gov>; Strauss, Alexis <Strauss.Alexis@epa.gov>; Blake, Ellen <Blake.Ellen@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Rich <Campbell.Rich@epa.gov>; Goldmann, Elizabeth <Goldmann.Elizabeth@epa.gov>; Ebbert, Laura <Ebbert.Laura@epa.gov>; Glenn, William <Glenn.William@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: EPA Rosemont files from Tony Davis

Greetings – see inquiry from Tony Davis below. My instinct is that these should be directed at Mike or higher (perhaps someone in HQ?). Your input on this is appreciated.

Many thanks,
margot

Margot Perez-Sullivan
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
D: 415.947.4149
C: 415.412.1115
E: perezsullivan.margot@epa.gov

From: Davis, Tony <TDavis@tucson.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 06, 2019 10:47 AM
To: PerezSullivan, Margot <PerezSullivan.Margot@epa.gov>
Subject: EPA Rosemont files from Tony Davis

Margot,

I have attached the three EPA memos on Rosemont that I was talking about just now. The first one, on the HMMP, I already wrote about, as you know, but I'm sending them all out of a sense of completeness. The Huiday responses will come in another email.

My questions about the EPA decision not to elevate the case:

a) These three memos offer very sharp, very detailed criticism of the mine on many grounds, including opinions that the mine's groundwater drawdown will cause significant impacts, that the mine will cause significant degradation of Waters of the US and that the mine's mitigation plan, featuring re-

establishment of Sonoita Creek and the Sonoita Creek Ranch purchase in general, is inadequate for many reasons.

Given all those criticisms, and given EPA's statements early on that Rosemont could be a good candidate for elevation, what were the agency's reason or reasons for not elevating this to DC for further review?

b) Did Hudbay's responses prove convincing to EPA?

c) If so, is that one reason the agency chose not to elevate this case?

d) If EPA's answer to question b is yes, could EPA please elaborate on what it found convincing about Hudbay's responses, since the agency has been raising many of these concerns or very similar concerns since 2012?

Sincerely,

Tony Davis
520-806-7746 o
520-349-0350 c